

REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on October 19, 2004, and made Final. Claims 8-25 are standing for examination. The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not supported by the specification. Claims 8, 9, 11-18, and 20-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikkola et al. of record, in view of Gossman (US 6,317,594, hereinafter Gossman. Claims 10 and 19 stand rejected over Mikkola in view of Gossman, and further in view of Tso, US 6,047,327, hereinafter Tso.

Applicant has carefully studied the prior art presented by the Examiner and the Examiner's rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. In response applicant herein amends the claims to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of applicant's invention regarded as patentable. Applicant points out and argues the limitations of applicant's claims as amended, which distinguish clearly and unarguably over the prior art cited and applied by the Examiner.

Regarding the rejection of claims 8 and 17 under section 112, the amendments above delete all of the subject matter from these two claims that is alleged to not be a part of the original disclosure, so the amendments render the 112 rejections moot.

Regarding the amendments under section 103(a) for claims 8 and 17, the applicant has further defined the nature of the client profile to include a specific information subject category of interest to the client, and has limited the retrieval of information to information that complies with said subject category.


Gossman, relied upon by the Examiner for the client profile, stores information pertaining to a client, as indicated by the Examiner, that is actually data about the client and history of client activities, not a specific subject category of interest to the client which may be used for sorting and selecting information falling into such a category.

The applicant believes therefore that the amended base claims are patentable to the applicant over the art cited and applied, and that all of the depended claims are now

patentable at least as depended from patentable base claims.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the present case be reconsidered and passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Harry A. Glorikian

by 
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457